

From: (b) (6)
Sent: Tuesday, September 06, 2016 2:15 PM
To: HarborComments
Subject: The devil is in the details!

How did the EPA & the Oregon DEQ decide to split up the clean-up responsibilities as designated in your proposal. If the EPA is only responsible for the underwater clean-up, isn't this the easier & cheaper portion since the river was already dredged in 1977? Also, by pouring rock cover over less contaminated areas, isn't there a risk that this cover will be washed away with the first spring run-off? Moreover, won't any rock coverage interfere with future clean-ups as more pollutants leach in from the large shore sited depots of pollutants? River clean-up will have less impact if the shore-based sources aren't cleaned up first. So, will onshore hot spots be completely cleaned up before any river work begins? Can the state will commit to a complete & timely clean-up of the shore-based hot spots if they are financially broke? Do they also have the power & political will to follow-up with legal action against the possible responsible parties? If not, then the hot spot sources will never be cleaned up & this effort will only be a sham exercise. The EPA should have assumed the shoreline & upland clean-up since this is the more critical part of the plan! Can you explain your rationale for coming up with this proposal? Your response would be appreciated. Thank you. (b) (6)